

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION: Examination showed that the articles contained (*Delfetamine Stedytabs*) methamphetamine HCl, and (*Delfeta-Sed Stedytabs*) methamphetamine HCl and amobarbital. The tablets in the cartons were repacked by the dealer from bulk stock shipped as described above.

LIBELED: 6-3-60, Dist. Md.

CHARGE: 502(d)—while held for sale, the *Delfeta-Sed Stedytabs* contained a habit forming drug, amobarbital, a derivative of barbituric acid, and their label failed to bear the name of the drug and in juxtaposition therewith the statement "Warning—May be habit forming"; and 505(a)—the *Delfetamine Stedytabs* and the *Delfeta-Sed Stedytabs* were new drugs which may not be introduced into interstate commerce since applications filed pursuant to the law were not effective with respect to such drugs.

DISPOSITION: 8-8-60. Default—destruction.

6482. Meprobamate tablets, chlorothiazide tablets, and hydrochlorothiazide tablets. (F.D.C. No. 44875. S. Nos. 4-661/2 R, 4-664 R.)

QUANTITY: Unknown quantities of the above-mentioned drugs at Washington, D.C., in possession of Discount Drugs.

LIBELED: 8-30-60, Dist. Columbia.

CHARGE: *Meprobamate tablets*, 502(i) (2)—while in interstate commerce, the article was an imitation of another drug, namely, Miltown tablets; and 502(i) (3)—the article was offered for sale under the name of another drug, namely, Miltown tablets.

Chlorothiazide tablets, 502(i) (2)—while in interstate commerce, the article was an imitation of another drug, namely, Diuril tablets; and 502(i) (3)—the article was offered for sale under the name of another drug, namely, Diuril tablets.

Hydrochlorothiazide tablets, 502(i) (2)—while in interstate commerce, the article was an imitation of another drug, namely, Hydrodiuril tablets; and 502(i) (3)—the article was offered for sale under the name of another drug, namely, Hydrodiuril tablets.

All articles, 505(a)—the articles were new drugs which may not be introduced into interstate commerce since applications filed pursuant to 505(b) were not effective with respect to such drugs.

DISPOSITION: 10-5-60. Default—delivered to the Food and Drug Administration.

VIOLATIVE SALES OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

6483. Phenobarbital tablets and amphetamine sulfate tablets. (F.D.C. No. 44941. S. Nos. 61-603/6 P, 61-608/12 P, 61-614 P, 61-616/8 P.)

INFORMATION FILED: 11-28-60, N. Dist. Ohio, against William H. Caine, M.D., Antwerp, Ohio.

SHIPPED: Between 5-30-59 and 7-18-59, from Ohio to Michigan.

CHARGE: 502(f) (1)—when shipped, the labeling of the articles failed to bear adequate directions for use for the purposes and conditions for which they were intended; and 503(b) (1)—the articles were drugs within the meaning of such section, and while being held for sale by the defendant, were dispensed by the defendant without a prescription.

PLEA: Guilty.

DISPOSITION: 12-16-60. \$325 fine and probation for 1 year.

DRUGS ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF FAILURE TO BEAR ADEQUATE DIRECTIONS OR WARNING STATEMENTS*

6484. Honegar. (F.D.C. No. 44382. S. No. 91-014 P.)

QUANTITY: Unknown quantities in 1-pt. and 1-qt. btls. at Albany, N.Y.

SHIPPED: On 2-18-60 and subsequent thereto, from Greenville, N.H., by B. T. Babbitt, Inc.

LABEL IN PART: (Btl. front panel) "Pure Honey & Apple Cidar Vinegar * * * HONEGAR * * * Honegar Division, 625 Madison Ave., New York 22, N.Y."

ACCOMPANYING LABELING: Reprint reading in part "New York Herald Tribune Honegar Found Useful as Recipe Ingredient * * * See and Hear the Honegar Story in this store today"; poster reading in part "K Kress Honegar America's Newest Home Remedy Sensation"; window streamer reading in part "You read about it in Life * * * Honegar"; display poster (inside text) reading in part "Read what Life, Time, Fortune say about Honegar"; and proof of newspaper advertisement reading in part "Would you like to try this simple 'home remedy'? * * * Honegar."

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION: The article was shipped as described above in connection with the filling of an order for 15,000 cases of 12 1-pt. bottles each, and 10,000 cases of 6 1-qt. bottles each, which had been placed for B. T. Babbitt, Inc., with the Rowse Co., of New Hampshire, Inc., Greenville, N.H., manufacturer and packer of the article.

LIBELED: 3-21-60, N. Dist. N.Y.

CHARGE: 502(b)(1)—when shipped and while held for sale, the article failed to bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and 502(f)(1)—the labeling of the article failed to bear adequate directions for use for the conditions and purposes for which it was intended, namely, for the treatment of arthritis; digestive disorders; belching; vomiting and diarrhea from food poisoning; constipation; obesity; high blood pressure; chronic fatigue; headaches, including migraine headaches; all infectious diseases, including typhoid, bronchopneumonia, peritonitis, pleurisy, dysentery, fungus diseases, common cold, chicken pox, measles; all childhood diseases; heart disease; heart attacks; essential hypertension; diabetes; insomnia; sterility; difficult labor; morning sickness; nervousness; tension; irritability; itching scalp and skin; numbness; cold hands and feet; dizziness; mental retardation; tooth decay; falling hair; breaking fingernails; paranasal sinusitis; seepage from sinuses; asthma; hay fever; facial neuralgia; retarded growth; pyelitis; thickened blood; ringing in ears; impaired hearing; Menieres syndrome; callouses and corns; slow healing of cuts and bruises; pimples; tic; cramps in muscles; blocked and swollen lymph glands; coughs; infant colic; bed-wetting; hangovers; alcoholism; and to provide vigor; promote longevity; maintain good health from the cradle to the grave; to control and reduce weight without restrictions of diet; and to reduce or eliminate the difficulties of old age.

DISPOSITION: On 5-10-60, B. T. Babbitt, Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the article was ordered released under bond to be brought into compliance with the law. The claimant subsequently submitted relabeling proposals to the Food and Drug Administration. Such proposals were rejected on 8-18-60, and there-

*See also No. 6483.